

# DISCONTENT

"MOTHER OF PROGRESS"

Entered at the Postoffice at Home, Wash., as Second Class Matter.

WASHINGTON STATE  
COLLEGE LIBRARY

VOL. IV. NO. 6.

HOME, WASH., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1901.

WHOLE NO. 162.

## AN OPEN LETTER TO JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

Dear Mr. Morton: You surely do not understand Miss Loud or myself. In your comments concerning us you speak of Miss Loud as an Anarchist upholding marriage laws, and of me as a reactionist. Miss Loud does not defend a law that would force Prof. Herron to remain with his first wife, but denounces him for shirking his responsibilities. And I, knowing nothing of the man but what appears in the papers, say that while I do not know Prof. Herron has done so, still, I have more sympathy with her denunciations than I have with the social radicals who applaud him, ignorant and careless of what might result from his action, bringing with it more harm than good. And I say this because there is so much of a tendency to regard the marriage relation superficially. Anyone voluntarily entering into a union with another immediately assumes obligations towards that other; and while I do not like a law compelling them to remain together, I do recognize a law of right conduct which makes it obligatory for only a mutual agreement to justify separation. If Mrs. Herron No. 1 is satisfied, so am I. I have no desire to "shed inky tears" over her; and it please you, sir, I am not trying to "patronize" Professor Herron. The real truth of the matter is that were I inclined to become reactionary, this senseless cavil, harsh criticism and unfriendly denunciation would indeed make me become so. But I am as much a radical as ever, good sir. A better one, I hope, since I, too, thought an unconventional action covered a multitude of wrongs. I like myself better when I am enabled to feel a thrill of admiration for the patient, conventional woman who bravely bears her burden, growing sweeter and better under her load, than the self-reliant, aggressive, radical woman who flings her burden aside, careless where it falls or whom it hurts. "If that be treason, make the most of it."

No, I have not any patronage to offer any "hero of progress." I am not pleading for any particular "poor man." Professor Herron was merely an illustration. I tried to enter a protest against this intolerant, harsh attitude towards people with whom we do not agree. Two of the most prominent Anarchist papers are almost wholly spoiled by it. And it is an open question if because of it they are not doing more harm than good. To read such a paper makes one feel depressed; and the world takes on sombre colors. Everything is spoiled by it. People who might otherwise read it attentively are repelled and disgusted; and valuable contributors go elsewhere with their copy. And despite the idea that seems to prevail of the necessity of such harshness, I assert its falseness. It is not true. Kindness and tolerance are the real good. And nowhere can its bless-

ing be made more manifest than in the columns of a paper devoted to the uplifting of the human race. I thank you, Mr. Morton, for your concluding words, and beg to subscribe myself your radical friend,

IDA BALLOU.

Reply.

Dear Friend: Your letter makes it appear that you are somewhat sensitive to criticism, which you mistake for "denunciation." When a radical, like Professor Herron, is attacked, you, admitting that you are imperfectly acquainted with the facts in the case, make haste to express your sympathy with those who denounce him. True, you plead for charity for the "poor man," (certainly a "particular poor man" in your original article, however he has since dwindled into "an illustration,") but such a charity as condemns, while it proffers mercy to the culprit. When I venture a demurrer, on the ground that Professor Herron is not a culprit at all, and needs neither charity nor toleration, but simply fair play, you turn on me with an accusation of "senseless cavil, harsh criticism and unfriendly denunciation." Now, I protest that, while my comment may have been "senseless," it was at least sincere; that it was a refutation, not a "denunciation;" that it was not intended to be "unfriendly;" and that what is "harsh" in it was not applied to you, but to the perennial enemies of progress. If I have impugned your radicalism, I had the warrant of your own word for it. You expressly ranked yourself outside of "the social radicals," indicating at least a desire that Miss Loud's readers should not look upon you as in any sense a radical, or as having the slightest sympathy with radicals.

I agree with you that intolerance and abuse (and I would add sympathy with the denunciation of a man for following his convictions) do more harm than good. But criticism, however severe, of a published article should not be taken as a personal attack.

I cannot see the logic or the radicalism in your claim that it is better to be a patient slave than to hurt the feelings of one who is selfishly trying to hold you in chains. To me the abnegation of individuality does not present itself in the light of a virtue. Kindly read the second paragraph of my "senseless cavil;" and point out wherein it fails to conform to as lofty a spirit of justice as that invoked by your "law of right conduct." In anticipation whereof, I remain Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

## A SOUND PROTEST.

Without in the least minimizing the public dangers of which the assassination of President McKinley gives warning, all thoughtful persons who believe in popular government will see in the reaction toward imperialism which that crime has intensified and emboldened,

far greater dangers than such crimes themselves involve. We do not refer to the lawless spirit of anger and revenge which has recently paraded with the sorrowful, and passed for grief. That is only the spirit of the mob; it has no lasting qualities. What we refer to is the imperialistic purpose, hitherto unpopular and restrained, but in consequence of the murder of the president now freely expressed and widely applauded—the purpose to abolish free government in this country. . . . Not only is it proposed for this purpose to abolish free speech and to establish a press censorship; but there is also a demand for the overthrow of another landmark of American liberty, by amending the federal constitution so as to make Anarchism treasonable and Anarchists punishable as traitors.

Naturally, the average man asks himself why these precautions against Anarchy should not be taken. To his imagination, an Anarchist is an ill-kempt person of forbidding visage, with a shock of uncombed hair upon his head, a bloody knife between his teeth, a pistol in one hand and a torch in the other, while every pocket bulges with dynamite bombs. This is the picture which incendiary newspapers of the respectable sort have made for him. Even if sensible enough to know that it is a caricature, he is not as a rule well enough informed to understand that the caricature is vicious.

For he sincerely believes that Anarchism is a theory of no government, to be realized by assassinating and terrorizing the conspicuous agents of government. This conviction has been fixed in his mind partly by assassinations of rulers by persons who declare themselves Anarchists, partly by Anarchist speeches which he has not heard but garbled reports of which he has read in his paper, partly by editorial and police misrepresentation, and partly by the assurances of persons who know no more about the subject than he does, but who impose upon him by looking profound and talking wise. . . .

The reason that revolutionary laws are demanded for the suppression of Anarchy, when existing laws meet every legitimate requirement, unless it be in some minor and easily corrected particulars, is twofold. In so far as this is a popular demand, it is due to popular ignorance of existing law, and of the history of those landmarks of liberty which the proposed laws against Anarchy would efface. In so far as the demand is not due to ignorance, it does not contemplate the suppression of murderous Anarchy at all. Its object is to stifle unpopular opinions. . . .

But blind indeed must that man be who sees in this program only a move against Anarchists. The sentiments of philosophic Anarchists that really make their speeches objectionable to the plutocratic engineers of this conspiracy against free government in America, are

cordially shared by everyone who opposes the political and economic influences which are everywhere making a few rich through privilege and keeping the many consequently poor. This crusade of plutocracy, nominally against Anarchists, is in reality against all who express those sentiments. It includes, also, such as oppose the policy of conquest, colonialism and imperialism. Indeed, it includes all who criticize with any vigor at all the political party which happens to be in power.

Is this not so? If not, why has the assassination of President McKinley been coolly charged to Bryanism? If not, why is it traced to Bryan's speeches criticizing the imperialistic policy upon which our republic has embarked, and the inequitable distribution of wealth which its laws promote? If not, why has it been charged to anti-imperialists? If not, why has it been charged to public men and private men, upon no other basis than that they have spoken against conquest, against militarism, against colonialism, against trusts and against other public policies that tend to subvert the principles of liberty and to make the few rich at the expense of the many?

Let there be no mistake. This movement for the abrogation of constitutional guarantees of free speech, and for the creation of a new form of treason—or rather the revival of an old one—has for its object larger game than philosophic Anarchists. No effective law to suppress philosophical Anarchists can possibly be drafted, which would not be a most powerful weapon for any party in power to use against the opposition.

The proposition to make it treason to commit an assault upon the president would, if adopted, be one of the hardest blows possible to level at American liberty. It is freighted with even greater danger to individuals than is the abrogation of the right of free speech. For if it were treason to make an assault upon the President, then, an assault being made, everyone who could be connected with its perpetrator personally, or shown to have spoken or written vigorously against the president's policy, would be subject to trial as a traitor. What a dragnet that would be for catching in its meshes patriotic men who were distasteful to a corrupt administration at Washington! Speakers and editors would speak and write with a sword hanging over their heads or a noosed rope dangling menacingly before them. They could never know when the "confession" of a crazy assassin and the malice of political enemies would not torture their legitimate criticisms into words counselling treason.—The Public.

The established laws and governments are the legitimate fruit of the spirit of government in the people, and as soon as the spirit of liberty takes its place will become distasteful and disappear.—J. W. Lloyd.



# DISCONTENT

"MOTHER OF PROGRESS".

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT HOME, WASH., BY  
DISCONTENT PUBLISHING GROUP.

50 CENTS A YEAR

Address all communications and make  
all money orders payable to DISCON-  
TENT, Home, Pierce County, Wash.

## OFF AND ON.

Two misconceptions concerning the relation between Anarchy and Socialism are very much in vogue at the present time. One is the statement industriously circulated by a certain portion of the capitalist press that both doctrines are substantially one, and consist principally in stirring up bad feeling and fomenting disorder. The other is the assertion of timid, bigoted or half-informed Socialists that Anarchy and Socialism are directly antipodal and the deadliest of enemies. Both declarations are so grossly exaggerated as well-nigh to destroy what modicum of truth they possess. Anarchy and Socialism are not identical, by long odds; but they are travelling by different routes to the same goal. The essence of Anarchy is liberty; and the essence of Socialism is cooperation. The two halves must and will unite somewhere, to form a perfect whole. Liberty without cooperation would be chaos; cooperation without liberty would be the dreariest and deadliest slavery. Not only are the two principles not antagonistic; but each is the necessary complement of the other. The true Socialist desires liberty, as the true Anarchist desires cooperation. The great problem is how to secure the one, without jeopardizing the other.

At this point occurs the parting of the ways, which may reconverge at some future time, when both have learned some much needed lessons. Time was when Anarchists and Socialists worked together, recognizing their common aim. The inevitable separation, which ultimately took place, arose from a difference of opinion regarding methods, and not from any disagreement relating to fundamental principles. The chasm has widened since; but the ideal Anarchist and the ideal Socialist, in spite of mutual recriminations, stand alike for liberty and cooperation. The fact that many Anarchists and Socialists are not ideal need not be considered, in connection with this phase of the subject, although it plays no inconspicuous part in complicating matters, and intensifying existing differences.

To attain the desired end, the Socialist proposes to weld the working class and its sympathizers together into what he terms a united class conscious political movement, with the avowed purpose of effecting an industrial reorganization of society. Holding that the establishment of the cooperative commonwealth will right all economic wrongs, and obliterate class divisions, he can conceive of no danger to liberty, in either the process or the result. It is assumed that the solution of the economic problem will solve everything else, or at least render the solution of all other questions a perfectly simple matter.

The Anarchist, with no less desire for economic freedom, cannot be regardless of other personal and social factors.

Back of the class struggle and economic exploitation, he sees the personal equation—the individual, who is never, even under modern capitalism, completely merged in his class. The Marxian approximation to a record of industrial evolution, although highly ingenious and squaring with many of the facts, has not to him the ring of genuine science. He realizes that it is safer to trust men with power over themselves, than with power over their fellows, and that the purest majority rule may be no less burdensome and heedless of the rights of the individual, than the arbitrary rule of one or a few. He posits liberty as the primary desideratum, not from any hostility to industrial association, but as a guarantee that such association shall be and remain voluntary and spontaneous. If the opportunity for exploitation be removed, mutual distrust will vanish; and self-interest will speedily lead to common action for economic purposes. The Socialist believes in liberty as the fruit of cooperation; the Anarchist believes in cooperation as the fruit of liberty.

George Boomer (Uncle Sam) devotes considerable space in *The Socialist* to a rather fishy attempt to prove that the philosophic Anarchist is worse than Czolgosz, being guilty of the unspeakable crime of failing to vote the Socialist ticket. Unfortunately for Mr. Boomer, the logic by which he supports his remarkable proposition might be aptly retorted on himself by the Bryanites, Populists or "pure and simple" trades unionists. They might hold him responsible for long hours, low pay, corrupt politics, trusts and many other evils of today, because he does not proceed directly against them in the precise manner which his critics would prescribe. The Woman Suffragist might tax him with maintaining an unjust and unequal system of representation. The Prohibitionist might thunder that he was guilty of the drunkenness of the nation and all the ills resulting from it, inasmuch as he did not join hands with those who were waging remorseless warfare on the liquor traffic. Well, his reply to the indictment would be simple enough. He would aver that these evils were only the effects of a diseased condition of society, and could not be cured, save by reaching the cause. Socialism, he would declare, may take longer to reach than some of these immediate applications; but its effect will be thorough and lasting. Can he not see that the Anarchist attitude toward political Socialism is identical with his attitude toward the palliative reformers? We cannot tread the same path as he, because we cannot see that it leads surely to the goal. We do not love capitalism any more than he; but we do not believe in the efficacy of the method he suggests for its demolition. Possibly our disbelief is founded on error. If so, it is clearly Mr. Boomer's duty to take pity on our ignorance, and to shed light in upon our darkened minds. In any case, it behooves him to recognize the fact that we are at least sincere in our delusion, and entirely undeserving of his vehement philippics.

Our image smashing friend says many good things; but he is off in his etymology. Anarchy is derived from the Greek, not from the Latin, and means

no rule. Arche, meaning rule, is not derived from Archon, the name given to the chief officials in Athens; but the two words come from the same root.

The Tacoma Evening News graciously concedes the right of Socialists to carry on their propaganda, unmolested by the Ku Klux methods of its proteges. It is careful to stipulate, however, that free speech should not be suppressed, EXCEPT where it is against the government, or immoral or Anarchistic. The Ledger of the same city continues to lie about Anarchists in a manner almost beyond belief, repeating ad nauseam statements whose utter falsity has been demonstrated over and over again. It goes even farther than the News in demanding the absolute suppression of free speech, and the most highhanded outrages on all who cannot recognize government as an ideally perfect institution, which must endure forever. If these papers are so dissatisfied with American institutions, why do they not follow the advice so often given by them to social reformers, and emigrate to a more congenial clime? Russia would exactly suit their conception of liberty, and is in fact made the subject of a long eulogistic editorial by one of them in a recent issue.

The contemptible tactics of governmentalism are forcibly illustrated in the treatment meted out to our comrades of Free Society. They were seized on a false charge, held without bail until their complete innocence could no longer be gainsaid, and then grudgingly released. Meanwhile, in flagrant violation of the elementary legal maxim, "No man shall take advantage of his own wrong," second-class privileges were withdrawn from the paper, on the ground that it had not appeared regularly! A new application has been made; and the current issue, which has already been printed, will be mailed as soon as possible. Meanwhile, our comrades are in no way compensated for the outrage committed on them, or for the trouble and expense to which they have been exposed. Stand by them, comrades!

There seems to be no limit to the wanton aggressions on free speech, reported from all parts of the country. In the Middle West, a society has been organized for the express purpose of maliciously working harm to all individuals who disbelieve in government. The boycott is to be invoked against those who are guilty of no offence but that of holding unpopular opinions. It looks like a revival of medieval barbarism, and is a sore disgrace to the twentieth century. Persecution for opinion's sake was supposed to be buried in the limbo of the past; and its sudden reappearance shows how short a distance lies between primitive barbarism and the semi-civilization of today.

The outrage on Free Society has already been mentioned. This, however, is only one of a series of attacks on the liberty of the subject. The unjust arrests of Emma Goldman and John Most, who had to be released because guiltless of offence, have been followed by the incarceration, on Heaven knows what trumped-up charge, of F. Ciancibilla, editor of *L'Aurora*, published by the Italian Anarchists of Spring Valley,

Ill. Anarchist meetings have been prohibited in city after city, that there might be no opportunity to refute the calumnies of press and pulpit. Persons expressing even the mildest Anarchist sentiments have been ostracized, boycotted and threatened with the fury of the mob. To detail all the wrongs heaped upon our comrades in different parts of the country, would require a vast amount of space. Honestly, now, can these tokens of persecution be expected to convince conscientious Anarchists that government and its supporters stand for the highest principles of freedom and equity?

Not only Anarchists, but all workers for more ideal social conditions, are becoming the victims of the unscrupulous proscription policy which is disgracing the country. An agent of the Appeal to Reason was arrested and ordered out of an Iowa town. Socialist meetings have been broken up in Tacoma and elsewhere, with at least the connivance of the authorities. One of the most extraordinary abuses of the power which, we are told, "was instituted for our protection," is the arrest of Morrison L. Swift for a book published over two years ago, in condemnation of the policy of imperialism adopted by the McKinley administration. If criticism of public policies is to be checked, it is not the Anarchist alone who will be compelled to recognize the fact that freedom is dead in this country.

I see little to differ from, in Comrade Barnes' present position, modifying, as it does, the views expressed in his previous letter. Only he misrepresents me, in charging me with a "denunciation of Christ." I honor the ideal Christ, whether man or myth, as I do Krishna, Buddha, Zoroaster, Lao Tse, Confucius, Pythagoras, Socrates and later prophets. I too respect an honest Christian, and often meet them on their own ground. I do not like the word Christian, however, because of its very derivation, it means the follower of a particular person, rather than of the full, rounded truth. I am opposed to calling a Free Thinker an Ingersollian, a Democrat a Jeffersonian, an Anarchist a Kropotkinian; and if there should be any mortal so deluded as to endorse all I write, I should not wish him to call himself a Mortonian. The word Christian is essentially as objectionable as any of these, and on historical grounds, decidedly more so. The genuine seeker for truth does well to avoid all sect names, as far as possible.

To Comrade Labadie I would say that each case must be met and judged on its own merits. The street or sewer plan which it would be best to recommend for Detroit under the conditions of today would not be the best plan for us to adopt here in Home; and the plan which is found to work well here would not fit all the communities of a free society. I cannot agree that it is necessary to offer a rigid program of how these things are to be conducted. Our special function is to show the feasibility of conducting them at all, without having recourse to the machinery of government. I hold that this is by no means a difficult task. Here at Home, we are tackling these questions as fast as they arise, and thus far have met with no insuperable difficulty.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.



## DEMOCRACY, REPUBLICANISM, ANARCHY.

In 1865 Abraham Lincoln was assassinated by Booth, a Democrat. He was hung, the men found with him when he was captured were hung. Mrs. Surratt, in whose barn Booth was found, was hung. That ended the legal murders, notwithstanding the four years of the most bloody war ever known on America's soil was just ended. That war that cost the lives of more than 300,000 northern soldiers, and that cost the government \$4,500,000,000 besides leaving a pension roll of more than a million and a half of cripples, widows, orphans, and dependent relatives, and that cost the lives of 130,000 confederates, whose connection are not cared for and left about as many cripples, who are not provided for, was all caused by Democrats and Republicans. Booth, the assassin, was a democrat, but there was no talk of exiling the Democrats for several good reasons. First, there were too many of them, they had well nigh succeeded in forming a confederacy of their own; besides they had sympathizers all over the world being known as governmentals. But the Republicans were bitter in their denunciations of Democracy because of it. R. G. Ingersoll, one of the few northern men that I would read after, said that "every northern soldier that had been killed or wounded was the deed of a Democrat." He also said that all the destruction of homes and property in the south was either done or caused by Democrats. Not once did he say exile them. Making them subjects of Republicanism was all the punishment he claimed should be inflicted upon them. I merely repeat the sentiments of Republicans here to show that it was the war prejudices, and not the assassination of a president, that engendered the bitterness between the two parties.

In 1880 James A. Garfield was assassinated by one Guiteau, a Republican; but no one talked about exiling the Republicans, because they were in the majority, and both the president and assassin were Republicans. They hung Guiteau—that was all. In 1901 Czolgosz, one who claims to be an Anarchist, assassinated William McKinley, a Republican president, and the holy howl goes up from Republicans and Democrats alike—"exile the Anarchists!" And this is government—the slaves have no rights that the masters are bound to respect.

Of course, Czolgosz will be electrocuted. Why shouldn't that end the matter, as execution of other assassins has done? Simply from the fact that there is no essential difference between governmentals, while Anarchists want to remove the cause of assassination and other crimes. If there were no governments there would be no presidents or rulers of any kind to assassinate. There hasn't been any difference between the two parties since the close of our so-called civil war, save which should have the spoils of office. Anyone living here could never tell the difference, if they didn't know which was in power. And yet true Democracy is nothing less than Anarchy gone to seed. Anarchy in its incipency never meant no government by rulers, but Democracy did. Anarchy is derived from two Latin words—an, no, and archy, the rule of the archons, meaning that the rule of the archons

must cease, but not that there should be no rulers by other names. In its modern meaning it is understood to mean the absence of all rulers, and we Anarchists of modern times interpret its meaning to be the absence of all governments, which is virtually the same. But we are in reality Democrats, pure and simple.

Democracy is derived from two Greek words—demos, the people, and kratos, the power, meaning all power is of and belongs to the people. The people have always been known to mean the body politic, or masses, in contradistinction from the rulers and office-holding classes. There's just about as much Democracy in this old organization of political thieves as there is sweet milk in sour apple vinegar.

Thomas Jefferson called his party the National Republican Party, simply from the fact that Democracy was at that time just as odious to the ruling classes as Anarchy is now. In the time of the French revolution ultra Jacobinism was called by the ruling classes rank Democracy, because its meaning was the absence of all government of men by their fellow men. The cry of all the rulers of the world at that time, and of those who wanted to be ruled, was execute and exile the Jacobins. Now they cry out execute and exile the Anarchists. And where will they exile them to, as they are now in every nation and country on earth, under one name or another? Russia tried exiling until all her best citizens were in Siberia, and still Nihilism is not abated in the least.

Anarchy is a principle in ethics, and, like the ghost of Banquo, it wont down. Legislating against it is like trying to make water run up hill.

Why should Anarchists be responsible for the assassination of McKinley any more than Democrats for the assassination of Lincoln, or Republicans for that of Garfield? No Anarchist could use language any more calculated to incite to murder than thousands of speakers representing both of the old parties have done; and yet they are considered blameless by their own partisans, and no attempt is made to exile them by the opposing party, even if riots and war are the result. But let one who believes in equal freedom for all make a speech, and if some one is killed soon afterwards, both the speaker and those in sympathy with him, or her, are held responsible to the ruling classes for it. O tempora! O mores!

IMAGE BREAKER.

## CHRISTIAN ANARCHY.

In your criticism of my letter on "Toleration" you take for granted what is not warranted by anything I ever said.

You seem to assume that I take Jesus as authority. But may not any one tell a truth? and if those who take him as authority deny the truth he tells, may not I who believe that truth, in order to convince a dissenter from that truth, quote his authority, without committing myself to all his authority says?

Whether Christ was a myth or not, and however contradictory his teachings, if men accept him as authority, may we Anarchists not consistently quote him to Christians where he teaches Anarchy?

If I can show a Protestant churchite that Jesus never authorized a church, and that the only place Christ is said to have used the word church, is the found-

ation of the Catholic church and probably interpolated by Catholics long after Christ lived, would it not weaken his faith in the church? I write for three of our country papers on Anarchy, and quote Christ as an Anarchist. I have often said in my articles that I did not take any person, or book, as authority, but quoted the Christian's authority as corroborating my views. I think we reach Christians in that way, where denouncing Christ, as you do, will repel them, and probably cause a rejection of my writings from the press. The church must be disintegrated along with government, if not first. If we can quote Christ as teaching morals and a free sociology; and that the church is not a moral but a religious institution; and opposed to the highest morals, we win men from the church. The best sign we see is the decadence of the church.

It is not important whether a man named Christ ever lived, or whether he was a myth, the important thing is to impress the truths purported to have come from the Christians' ideal Christ.

I don't see how it militates against Anarchy to show that Christ was an Anarchist, and opposed to the church, and taught by precept and example the very truths we believe in. I am always careful to show that his teaching is opposed to the church, in so much as he was an Anarchist.

J. C. BARNES.

## THE SUPERIOR SEX.

The true idea of the superiority of sex is not to judge by what men and women now are, or have been, but what they would be under correct conditions of perfect equality of sex. That the female is naturally the supreme animal seems to be an indisputable fact.

Nature always aims, so to speak, to produce a female. Males are an arrested development—that is, uncompleted females.

Senhik says: Beginning with silkworms they produce a preponderance of male moths when ill fed, and the same with other animals or insects.

Savage tribes in times of great want show an abnormal increase of males. He proves that sex is regulated by the albuminous feed of the mother, and in 41 cases 39 produced females and two failed because the mothers did not follow the instructions.

We know a woman can become more refined, moral and intelligent than a man can, and also descend lower into vice, crime and depravity; and this is because she is a higher grade of animal. Remember all this does not, in the least, degrade man or hinder him from continual ascent and progress. The higher the female, the higher the male necessarily becomes. Thousands of males will always be more intelligent than the average females, even if they cannot equal the higher grade of femininity. Woman is the fountain and, as a whole, man cannot rise above it. She can lift him up, but not to the height she is capable of attaining. Even if some women scream at the sight of a worm, she is acknowledged by all to be the bravest of the brave where need calls. Fashion and Mrs. Grundy demand that woman should act childish, puerile and ignorant, and be clinging vines, but all this is merely the result of wrong conditions which the evolution of the ages will eliminate and destroy.

ELMINA DRAKE SLENKER.

## CRANKY NOTIONS.

But, dear Comrade Morton, my inquiries are not only pertinent at first blush; but they are pertinent at second blush and all the blushes succeeding.

Is it not true that the street car question is a living and ever-present one in every city and town in the country whose population goes into the thousands? Is it not true that the questions of lighting, and sewerage and paving and all the other needs of a thickly settled community are continually pressing—not in the future, but now? The Republican, the Democrat, the Populist, the State Socialist, indeed the whole school of Archists have definite propositions to make and do make them as to how these things would be done; and they are done in one or another Archistic way. Now, has the Anarchist no practical propositions to make? Is he to continue to cry liberty, liberty and nothing but liberty? Has he no economic policy that harmonizes with freedom? It needs no powers of prediction to deal with questions of this nature. They are not for the future; they are for now, today. They are not bridges to be crossed sometime in the far away. We are at the stream and need to cross. How are we to cross, and not get wet in the waters of injustice, of Archism? These are not problems for Home alone. They are universal.

Let me put it another way. Quite frequently in this city meetings are held in the parlors of interested people to discuss questions of public import. I receive invitations to these meetings. Tom, Dick, Harry make speeches. We all need a street railway service. How are we to get it? Everybody has a plan. "Will Mr. Labadie give us his views of the question? He has devoted study to them and should be able to help out," somebody says. What should Mr. Labadie say? What would you, say? If we are not to always rest under the charge of being mere dreamers, cranks, murderers, degenerates, etc., etc., for a stickful or two, what answer are we to give to these practical questions?

Scratch every other one you meet and the blood will flow from a savage. These stressful times prove this quite conclusively. The ignorance of press, pulpit and politician on questions of social science is appalling; and the mighty ogres of Ignorance, Bigotry, Prejudice stalk through the land like mad mastodons, and crush everything in their way. Here in Detroit it is simply astounding, the attitude of these elements; and what the final result will be no one can predict. It is unsafe for any one even to suggest that there might be some mistake on the part of these hysterical people as to the real position of the Anarchist relative to assassination, crime and social-economic problems, and the modes of realizing their aims. Now is a time when we need our patience. We must not be surprised at whatever occurs. Persecution will be the order of the day, and many of us will be called upon to suffer all sorts of indignities. Indeed, John Shillady, a bright young friend of mine, went to the Fourteenth Avenue Church of this city, last Sunday, to hear Anarchy discussed. After the chief slanderer got through, persons in the audience were invited to make three minute speeches on the subject; and it



was taken advantage of by quite a number whose lack of knowledge of the subject would fill several volumes. Mr. Shillady took the floor and suggested that it was deplorable that so many people knew so little of what they were talking about, and gave a few facts about Anarchism. After the meeting, a crowd gathered about him and fired questions at him, which he answered in a plain, dignified way. One old fellow shook his fist in Shillady's face and said he ought to be hung. Mr. Shillady has two fine sisters who teach in the public schools. What was his astonishment to learn that members of the John Russell Union, a Baptist organization under whose auspices the meeting had been held, were trying to have his sisters lose their places; and his discharge was asked at a place where he was supposed to work. One Wylie, secretary of the union, has acted like a savage in hunting the Shilladys. And these kind, tolerant, intelligent gentlemen are Christians (?), active, leading members of the church. What more needs be said?

JOSEPH A. LABADIE.

### OUR FIGHT FOR A FREE PRESS.

The significance of the arrest of Larkin, Govan and Adams is greater than many will appreciate. It is really the concern of every Liberal in the country. No question of Anarchy or free love is involved. The issue is purely one of the right of free speech. Never mind how much you may dislike Discontent, or how opposed you may be to the policies advocated by it. What is your Liberalism really worth? Do you believe in free speech, even for an opponent? The pretext of obscenity is so transparently absurd as to be almost beneath contempt. The whole animus and purpose of the prosecution is to destroy the honest discussion of social problems. Is this to your liking? Do you know how soon it may be your turn, or that of the representative of some idea in which you are vitally interested? The enemies of all liberty and progress, who are back of the present outrage, openly boast that this is only the beginning of prosecutions. The situation is more critical than ever before. This is a test case, in every sense of the word. A conviction now would be of more consequence than in any preceding case. It would establish a precedent of no little importance. The imperialist element is determined to establish a rigorous censorship; and this is one of the first steps to that end. It depends on the vigilance of the liberty-loving public to determine whether it shall or shall not be the last.

In this case, the comrades at Home are fighting the battle of the Liberals of the country. This they cannot do all by themselves. Much money will be needed to carry on the work of defence. A local defence committee has been formed, which will work incessantly from now until February. O. A. Verity, Home, Wash., is the treasurer. He will receipt for all money sent in, and will account for the mode of its expenditure. Contributions are invited from all who are interested in the freedom of the press.

### RECEIPTS.

Lindstrom \$1, McMurphy 50c, Leonhardt 50c, Jackson 50c, Eccleston 10c.

### HOME NEWS.

L. Frank Odell was with us for several days this week.

Harry Dadieman has returned after an absence of a couple of months.

We enjoyed a very pleasant visit last week from L. E. Rader, of Olalla.

Oscar Carlson, of Anderson Island, paid us a flying visit, last Tuesday.

Rev. E. F. Doescher, of Tacoma, has been making us another brief visit.

Charles L. Govan spent several days, this week, at the Lindstrom home, on Anderson Island.

Mrs. Lindstrom, of Anderson Island, and her daughters, Julia and Christina, are welcome visitors with us.

Annie E. Larkin, and her four children, have returned after spending the past four months with relatives in Nebraska.

Quite a party of colonists have gone to Alaska for a few months, in various capacities, including George and Ida Allen, William and Eliza King and John Adams. We shall miss them greatly this winter, but look forward to their safe and prompt return.

The land owned by the Mutual Home Association is located on Von Geldern Cove (known locally as Joes Bay), an arm of Carrs Inlet, and is 13 miles west from Tacoma on an air line, but the steamer route is about 20 miles.

The association is simply a land-holding institution, and can take no part in the starting of an industry. All industries are inaugurated by the members interested and those willing to help them. Streets are not opened yet and we have no sidewalks. Those thinking of coming here must expect to work, as it is not an easy task to clear this land and get it in condition for cultivation. There are 87 people here—24 men, 23 women and 40 children—girls over 15 years 4, boys 3. We are not living communistic, but there is not anything in our articles of incorporation and agreement to prohibit any number of persons from living in that manner if they desire to do so. Those writing for information will please inclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope for reply.

### POSTAL TYRANNY.

You may inform the readers of Discontent that two issues (since we were released) of Free Society have been printed; but so far we were not permitted to mail the paper UNDER ANY CONDITION. And from Washington no reply has come till this hour. A. ISAAC.

### HOW TO GET TO HOME.

All those intending to make us a visit will come to Tacoma and take the steamer TYPHOON for HOME. The steamer leaves Commercial dock every Monday, Wednesday and Friday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock. Leaves Sunday morning at 8 o'clock.

## BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS FOR SALE BY DISCONTENT

Perfect Motherhood. Lois Waisbrooker.	1 00
Irene or the Road to Freedom. Sada Bailey Fowler.	1 00
Business Without Money. W. H. Van Ornum.	50
Helen Harlow's Vow. Lois Waisbrooker.	25
God and the State. By Michael Bakunin.	05
Moribund Society and Anarchy. By Jean Grave.	25
Anarchy. By Enrico Malatesta. Is It All a Dream? By Jas. F. Morton, Jr.	10
God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition. W. E. Nevill.	05
The Chicago Martyrs; The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Judge Gary's Court, and Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe and Schwab.	25
Five Propaganda Leaflets on the Sex Question.	10
Personal Rights and Sexual Wrongs What the Young Need to Know. E. C. Walker.	30
The Revival of Puritanism. E. C. Walker.	10
Appeal to the Young. Kropotkin. Mating or Marrying, Which? W. H. Van Ornum.	05
The Evolution of the Family. Jonathan Mayo Crane.	05
Love in Freedom. Moses Harman.	05
The Evolution of Modesty. Jonathan Mayo Crane.	05
The Regeneration of Society. Lillian Harman.	05
Motherhood in Freedom. Moses Harman.	05
Institutional Marriage. M. Harman.	05
A Tale of the Strassburg Geese.	05
The Coming Woman. Lillie D. White.	05
Plain Words on the Woman Question. Grant Allen. With remarks by E. C. Walker.	05
Variety vs. Monogamy. E. C. Walker.	05
Marriage and Morality. Lillian Harman.	05

## OUR WORSHIP OF PRIMITIVE SOCIAL GUESSES BY EDWIN C. WALKER

No man is wise enough to foresee the secondary results of any proposed restriction, and no history is copious enough to record the evils that have ensued upon denials of liberty.—George E. Macdonald.

### CONTENTS:

Love and the Law; the Moloch of the Monogamic Ideal; the Continuity of Race Life and Tyranny; Food and Sex Fallacies; a criticism; When Men and Women Are and When They Are Not Varietists; the New Woman, What Is She? What Will She Be? the State Hiding Behind Its Mistakes; Bishop Potter's Opinion of Divorce; Love, Its Attractions and Expression; Is She an Honest Girl? Lloyd, Platt and the Pitiful Facts; Social Radicals and Parentage.

Appendix: Anthropology and Monogamy; Love and Trust versus Fear; Reflections upon reading William Platt's "Women, Love and Life." Price, 15 cents. For sale by DISCONTENT.

## THE NEW HEDONISM. BY GRANT ALLEN.

Grant Allen needs no introduction to reading, thinking men and women. Man of science, a writer of charming expository and imaginative prose, he was, perhaps, at his best when bravely leading on, as in this brilliant brochure, in the fight against degrading religious and moral superstitions and time-sacred wrongs. No brief description can tell you what this splendid little work embraces no short excerpts can satisfy you. Price 5 cents.

FOR SALE BY DISCONTENT.

### MEETING.

The Independent Debating Club meets every Sunday at 2 p. m., at 209 Market street, San Francisco, Calif. Free discussion. Public invited.



Contains full, plain, and easy reading treatise on "Health and Disease, with Recipes," all the average reader can profitably learn of personal hygiene and common diseases (including special, separate chapters for men and women); all right up-to-date, and fully illustrated with hundreds of photo-engravings and chromo-lithographs. Contains also the already popular "Plain Home Talk" about the relations of the sexes and social customs in all ages and all countries, with "original and startling" suggestions for social reforms; newly revised, enlarged, and well illustrated. All is "heart to heart" plain home talk from a clear thinking, plain speaking, liberal minded medical author of over forty years' experience. Nearly 1,000,000 of his former books sold. A curious book for curious people, and a sensible book for everyone. Answers 1001 delicate questions one would like to ask his regular physician and yet doesn't want to. 1248 pages, 400 illustrations (80 in colors), 250 recipes. Price, clothbound, \$2, mailed. 240 SAME PAGES, including two full chapters, in handsome "Flashlight" cover, mailed for 6 cents postage.

### Tecology for Mothers

336 pages, illustrated, cloth bound; by mail \$1. American reprint of "The Wife and Mother Medical Guide," an up-to-date English work, with added illustrations in the text, and twelve artistic and appropriate full page half-tone engravings. The latest and best book for popular instruction on child-bearing and child-caring. Edited for this country by Dr. E. B. Foote, Jr. MURRAY HILL PUB. CO., 129 E. 25th St., New York.

### Articles of Incorporation and Agreement of the Mutual Home Association.

Be it remembered, that on this 17th day of January, 1898, we, the undersigned, have associated ourselves together for the purpose of forming a corporation under the laws of the State of Washington.

That the name of the corporation shall be The Mutual Home Association. The purpose of the association is to assist its members in obtaining and building homes for themselves and to aid in establishing better social and moral conditions.

The location of this corporation shall be at Home, located on Joes Bay, Pierce County, State of Washington; and this association may establish in other places in this state branches of the same where two or more persons may wish to locate.

Any person may become a member of this association by paying into the treasury a sum equal to the cost of the land he or she may select, and one dollar for a certificate, and subscribing to this agreement.

The affairs of this association shall be conducted by a board of trustees, elected as may be provided for by the by-laws.

A certificate of membership shall entitle the legal holder to the use and occupancy of not less than one acre of land nor more than two (less all public streets) upon payment annually into the treasury of the association a sum equal to the taxes assessed against the tract of land he or she may hold.

All money received from memberships shall be used only for the purpose of purchasing land. The real estate of this association shall never be sold, mortgaged or disposed of. A unanimous vote of all members of this association shall be required to change these articles of incorporation.

No officer, or other person, shall ever be empowered to contract any debt in the name of this association.

All certificates of membership shall be for life.

Upon the death of any member a certificate of membership shall be issued covering the land described in certificate of membership of deceased.

First: To person named in will or bequest.

Second: Wife or husband.

Third: Children of deceased; if there is more than one child they must decide for themselves.

All improvements upon land covered by certificate of membership shall be personal property, and the association as such has no claim thereon.

Any member has the right of choice of any land not already chosen or set aside for a special purpose.

### CERTIFICATE OF MEMBERSHIP.

This is to certify that has subscribed to the articles of incorporation and agreement and paid into the treasury of the Mutual Home Association the sum of . . . dollars, which entitles . . . to the use and occupancy for life of lot . . . block . . . as platted by the association, upon complying with the articles of agreement.

SEND 10 CENTS for specimens of 10 Liberal papers and 10 tracts, circulars and sample of stocking yarn, or 3 cents for a copy of "Little Free Thinker." Kimina Drake Henker, Snowville, Va.